

**NetworkMaryland Advisory Group  
Monthly Meeting**

June 17, 2003, 9:00 am – 1:00 pm  
45 Calvert Street  
Annapolis, Maryland

---

**ADVISORY GROUP ATTENDEES:**

Mary Ann Slack (Acting Vice Chair)  
Ellis Kitchen  
Richard Aldridge  
Jem Pagan (for Judi Wood)  
Mike McCarty  
William Morrow  
Chris Foster

Pat Wallace  
Richard Rose  
Paul Thorn  
Renee Winsky  
Ron Ward (for Chuck Bristow)  
Barb Pivec

**DBM STAFF ATTENDEES:**

Pat Stevens  
Jason Ross  
Mary Ann Slack  
Tim Kwong  
Bill Dye

**GUESTS:**

Craig Ponton  
Michael Walsh  
Stuart Ragland  
Amy Demarco

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
M. Slack	<u>Call to Order</u> – The Meeting was called to order at 9:15 am Welcome and Introductions		
Members	<u>Approval of May Minutes</u> – The Members approved the minutes from the May meeting with no modifications.		
E. Kitchen	<u>Project Team Organization</u>  Ellis announced Margo’s resignation and his intent to replace her.  Ellis also noted that he would be augmenting the nwMD project team with two additional engineering resources and someone to promote and educate external entities about networkMaryland.		
T Kwong	<u>State of the Network</u>  Tim provided an overview of networkMaryland customer activity to date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Currently on board:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13 Major Agencies</li> <li>• 4 Offices &amp; Commissions</li> <li>• Major University</li> <li>• County Government</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Implementations in progress:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Major Agencies</li> <li>• 4 Offices and Commissions</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Already submitted JCR’s and discussions to take place</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Major Agencies</li> <li>• University System</li> </ul> </li> </ul> Customers range from 60 to 8,000 employees  Tim also noted that migration time is dependent on multiple factors, several of which (such as acquiring a local loop circuit) are beyond the control of the team or connecting entity.		

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
	However, connection to networkMaryland at an existing point of presence (e.g., the MANs) is fast.		
J Ross	<p><b>Jason provided an overview of the approved network design and implementation status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Phase II design finalized and approved</li> <li>– New design within time and budget requirements</li> <li>– Western MD build-out underway</li> <li>– A-B-C OC-48 Sonet Ring underway</li> <li>– Southern MD build-out follows</li> </ul> <p>Jason also noted looking-forward plans and potential services for the network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–Expand points of presence</li> <li>–Support Voice traffic</li> <li>–Increase network peering where beneficial</li> <li>–Integrate with Wireless Network Infrastructure</li> <li>–Potential new SwGI services: DNS, Web hosting</li> </ul>	Richard Rose suggested that space may be available on AT&T wireless towers.	
M. Slack	<p><b><u>networkMaryland Project Status</u></b></p> <p>Mary Ann provided an overview on the status of project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FiberGate buildout progressing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–Level 3 connections to be finished 6/18</li> <li>–Construction pending Verizon make-ready</li> <li>–On track for mid-Sept. completion</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Annapolis spur <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–Design under review by SHA</li> <li>–Alternative – A.A. County Collaboration?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Western Maryland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–Spurs to Frederick, Hagerstown near completion</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Managed Services Contract Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To BPW 7/2/03 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– No further Delays Anticipated</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Transition Plan Ready</li> </ul>	<p>A recommendation was made that future meetings include a status of the operating network in addition to project status. Mary Ann agreed to include this in future meetings.</p> <p>It was suggested that the team investigate possible collaboration in areas with many fiber owners such as St. Mary's County as a solution to last mile connectivity.</p>	

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
R. Winsky	<p><u>Economic Development - HB697</u></p> <p>Renee reported that names for nominees for the Task Force are due by December 1, 2003. The proposed number of members is 20. Currently, 8 members have been nominated. They are hopeful that the first meeting will occur in July. Also, it has been proposed that an elected official should be the chairperson for the Task Force.</p> <p>Although not fully staffed, TEDCO and DBED are proceeding to compile information for the Task Force.</p>		
R. Rose	<p><u>Baltimore Education Network (BERNet)</u></p> <p>Richard reported that equipment had been purchased and received and requires only installation. It is expected that everything will be in place by the end of July.</p>		
	<p><u>Public meeting adjourned. There were no comments from the public.</u></p> <p>•</p>		
J. Pagan	<p><u>NwMD Working Group Update</u></p> <p>Jem Pagan reported for Judi Wood on the progress of the ITAC Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion regarding all items continues</li> <li>• Survey of State Agencies is planned to collect requirements</li> <li>• Outline of final report defined; all sub-groups contributing the content</li> <li>• The report will be a written recommendation to DBM regarding nwMD</li> <li>• Striving to meet July deadline for first draft of report</li> </ul>		
W. Morrow	<p><u>Engineering Committee Report</u></p> <p>Will Morrow presented the Engineering committee Mission for review and approval.</p>		

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
	<p><b><u>Mission Proposed</u></b>  The Engineering Committee of the NetworkMaryland Advisory Group will use the best engineering talent available from NetworkMaryland stakeholders to inform the technical decision making process for NetworkMaryland. The Committee will support the Advisory Group decision-making process by proposing or reviewing technical standards, network designs, operational practices, network change requests, and producing studies and reports. The Committee will strive to ensure that decisions are technically feasible and beneficial and that they promote ubiquitous network access and cost effectiveness.</p> <p>The Engineering Committee will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validate that existing and proposed network designs will support the approved business requirements of all current and potential customers</li> <li>• Review network proposals and make technical recommendations to the Advisory Group</li> <li>• Recommend NetworkMaryland technical standards that impact infrastructure reliability, security, interoperability, performance, or other network operations.</li> <li>• Perform comparative studies against other statewide or similar networks</li> <li>• Recommend practices to improve network operations</li> </ul> <p>Comment on the technical impacts of any proposal requested by the Advisory Group</p>	<p>R. Rose suggested dropping everything after “available” in the first sentence.</p> <p>Motion was made and seconded to approve the Mission with the change.  Motion passed unanimously.</p>	
W. Morrow	<p>Will also presented the Engineering Committee’s proposed operating procedures for comments and discussion. No approval was requested.</p> <p><b><u>Engineering Committee Operating Procedures Requests for Recommendations</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests for recommendations should be sent from the Chair of the NetworkMaryland Advisory Group, or designee, to the Chair of the NetworkMaryland Advisory Group Engineering Committee at least one week prior to the Engineering Committee meeting via email. Proposals received after that time will be considered at the meeting the following month. The Engineering Committee will review proposals on an emergency basis via email when requested by the</li> </ol>	<p>It was noted that the engineering committee would operate primarily electronically.</p> <p>Will suggested emailing any further comments to him for incorporation into the procedures.</p>	

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
	<p>Chair of the Advisory Group.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Engineering Committee will evaluate proposals based on the following criteria: technical quality, feasibility, schedule, impact on bandwidth, cost effectiveness, and conformity to standards. The recommendation will include strengths and weaknesses of the proposal for each criteria, a Committee summary, and a record of the Committee vote.</li> <li>Requests for recommendations must include information about the current state and proposed state of the network, diagrams, and the criteria described in 2. above.</li> <li>The Engineering Committee may request a briefing from the proposer.</li> </ol> <p><b>Requests for Comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests for comments will be accepted from the Chair of the NetworkMaryland Advisory Group via email.</li> <li>The Engineering Committee Chair will circulate the request via email to the Engineering Committee members, who will attach their comments and return to the requestor.</li> </ol> <p>The Engineering Committee will discuss the request at the next meeting to determine if a comment from the Committee as a whole is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Requests for Studies</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests for comments will be accepted from the Chair of the NetworkMaryland Advisory Group via email. The request must include what research questions are to be answered by the study.</li> <li>The Engineering Committee will assess what research methodology is appropriate and what the resource and time requirements are to complete the study.</li> <li>Based on the initial review of the request, the Engineering Committee will notify the Chair of the Advisory Group whether the Committee will accept the request or not, with comments.</li> </ol> <p><b>General</b></p> <p>The Engineering Committee may generate recommendations, comments, or studies without first receiving a request from the NetworkMaryland Advisory Group.</p>		
P. Wallace	<p><b><u>Bylaws&amp; Policy Committee</u></b></p> <p>Pat Wallace presented the committee's recommended changes to the charter and bylaws:</p> <p><b><u>Article III, Section 2 (recommended change)</u></b></p> <p>–The Advisory Group exists to provide:</p>	<p>Copies of the current version of the articles were distributed to the group for comparison with recommended changes.</p>	<p>By-Laws Committee to review the rest of the document</p>

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• representation and active participation of all stakeholders,</li> <li>• advice and expertise on a wide range of issues related to net.work.maryland, including customer needs and evaluation of services</li> <li>• advocacy</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Article III, Section 3 (recommended change)</u></b>          –The responsibilities of the net.work.Maryland Advisory Group are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• act as the representative for each stakeholder group providing a continuing arena for stakeholder input and communication;</li> <li>• provide advice on key issues facing net.work.maryland;</li> <li>• provide recommendations concerning capital and operating budgets;</li> <li>• assist with prioritization of approved funded work efforts;</li> <li>• provide input to the development of a multiyear strategic plan and to budget forecasts for net.work.Maryland.</li> </ul>	<p>Pat Wallace noted that the bullet regarding oversight and direction was dropped from Article III Section 2.</p> <p>It was proposed that net.work.Maryland be changed to networkMaryland</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommended change to Article III Section 2 with the changed name. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Discussion was held among members regarding the Advisory Group's responsibilities with respect to requirements and strategy.</p> <p>Mary Ann noted that the team needed the group's input on requirements.</p> <p>Paul Thorn noted that the strategic plan should be completed.</p> <p>Ellis Kitchen stated that the networkMaryland team should be responsible for requirements and long-term strategy with input from the Advisory Group.</p> <p>Motion was made and seconded to approve the recommended change to Article III Section 3. Motion was unanimously approved.</p>	<p>based on the approved changes.</p>
M. McCarty C. Ponton	<p><b><u>Stakeholder Collaboration</u></b></p> <p>Mike McCarty and Craig Ponton presented and discussed the Johns Hopkins Hospital's JHARS DHCP self server svstem and its potential</p>	<p>Mike stated that he would provide 90 days manpower to support anyone</p>	

Reported By:	Presentation Topics	Comments and Actions	Completion
	for nwMD and the stakeholders.	interested in implementing the tool.  Will Morrow offered to facilitate further discussion between the Engineering Committee, JHU, and the ITAC working group for IP addressing. Richard Rose requested to be included in the discussion.	
E. Kitchen	<p><b><u>Rate Structure Update</u></b></p> <p>Ellis reported his strong desire to have DBM assume the cost of operating the network for State agencies, and to impose a rate structure to non-State agencies that would be substantially less than that offered by other carriers. An exception would be those State agencies with federal or other funding – those agencies would be charged a severely reduced rate to avoid impacting their funding. His proposal has been positively received thus far by Chip.</p>	<p>Richard Rose noted that the rate structure for non-State agencies is needed.</p> <p>Ellis stated that the rate structure for non-state agencies should be available in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter CY03.</p>	
	<b><u>Adjournment-</u> The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.</b>		

**Minutes Recorded by:**  
Pat Stevens